



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/760,044	01/18/2004	Mitchell M. Rohde	1048.004US1	8490
23441 7590 10/03/2008 LAW OFFICES OF MICHAEL DRYJA 1474 N COOPER RD #105-248 GILBERT, AZ 85233				
EXAMINER				
HU, KANG				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3714				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
10/03/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES**

Application Number: 10/760,044
Filing Date: January 18, 2004
Appellant(s): ROHDE ET AL.

Michael A. Dryja
For Appellant

EXAMINER'S ANSWER

This is in response to the appeal brief filed June 26th, 2008 appealing from the Office action mailed June 4th, 2007.

(1) Real Party in Interest

The real party in interest is Quantum Signal, LLC.

(2) Related Appeals and Interferences

The examiner is not aware of any related appeals, interferences, or judicial proceedings which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

(3) Status of Claims

The statement of the status of claims contained in the brief is correct.

(4) Status of Amendments After Final

The appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief is correct.

(5) Summary of Claimed Subject Matter

The summary of claimed subject matter contained in the brief is correct.

(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal

The appellant's statement of the grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal is correct.

NEW GROUND(S) OF REJECTION

Claims 1-8 and 10-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Howard et al. (US 2004/0133582 A1)

Claims 13 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Family Tree DNA, familytreedna.com

Claims 9 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Howard (US 2004/0133582 A1) in view of Walker et al (US 6,110,041).

Claims 13-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Howard (US 2004/0133582 A1)

(7) Claims Appendix

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

(8) Evidence Relied Upon

US 2004/0133582 A1	Howard et al.	10-2003
"Description, FAQ, Privacy and Confidentiality Statement"	Family Tree DNA - Genealogy by Genetics, Ltd. World Headquarters.	12-2003

(9) Grounds of Rejection

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

112 1st rejection:

1. Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claims(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. Claim 1, lines 4 and 5 states "database of biometric information of a plurality of predetermined people other than the customer and with which the customer is likely to be familiar to." The specification fails to

disclose of any method or system that would exclude the current customer to be in the database. Nor does the specification teach of providing a method of having a database full of people that the customer is likely to be familiar with. The specification of the application does not provide any enablement of how the machine would know who to exclude from the database and who the customer is familiar with. Claims 2-7 are rejected for their dependency upon claim 1.

102(e) rejection:

2. Claims 1-8 and 10-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Howard et al. (US 2004/0133582 A1).

Re claim 1, Howard teaches a method comprising, detecting biometric information of the customer by an entertainment machine (Abstract; fig 2, 22; fig 3, 40; ¶ 36, input device is constructed and arranged to receive first and second biometric search templates); the entertainment machine comparing the biometric information of the customer against a database of biometric information of a plurality of predetermined people other than the customer and with which the customer is likely to be familiar to yield one or more people having biometric information that most closely matches the biometric information of the customer (¶ 36, computerized system for determining whether a database contains an image substantially matching that of a given probe candidate; ¶ 45, determining whether a database contains any images that substantially match those of an individual – it would be impossible to eliminate the customer from the database unless the identity of the customer is readily known ahead of the time and is excluded from the database to be searched. Therefore the examiner asserts that it would be inherent that the database may or may not have biometric information of the customer

depending on the database, hence the customer would be compared against a database of biometric information other than the customer himself; ¶ 148, ex-girlfriend or boyfriend, a celebrity or model, an idealized image created by the individual, an image that closely resembles the individual himself or herself, etc.); and, indicating to the customer by the entertainment machine of identities of the one or more people having biometric information that most closely matches the biometric information of the customer (Figs 4, 5, 8 and ¶ 32 – 65).

Howard further teaches:

Re claim 2, detecting the biometric information of the customer comprises acquiring one or more of: facial images of the customer; voice samples of the customer; finger print scans of the customer; handprint scans of the customer, and, retinal eye scans of the customer (¶ 19 and 26).

Re claim 3, comparing the biometric information of the customer against the database of biometric information of the plurality of predetermined people other than the customer comprises comparing the biometric information of the customer against one or more databases selected from a database of biometric information of a plurality of famous individuals; a database of biometric information of a plurality of sports stars; a database of biometric information of plurality of celebrities; a database of biometric information of a plurality of politicians; a database of biometric information of a plurality of historical figures; and, a database of biometric information of a plurality of fictitious characters (¶ 148).

Re claim 4, the biometric information of the customer against the database of biometric information of the plurality of predetermined people other than the customer comprises yielding a predetermined number of the one or more people having biometric information that most closely matches the biometric information of the customer (§ 19-23)

Re claim 5, comparing the biometric information of the customer against the database of biometric information of the plurality of predetermined people other than the customer comprises yielding the one or more people having biometric information that most closely matches the biometric information of the customer as the one or more people having biometric information that matches the biometric information of the customer by more than a threshold (§ 26, threshold being the match score in this case, the score is a measure of the level of confidence that the probe facial image and a target image from the candidate list match each other; § 127, the threshold might be set to be all results having a face score of 75 or greater).

Re claim 6, indicating to the customer by the entertainment machine of the identities of the one or more people having biometric information that most closely matches the biometric information of the customer comprises displaying at least one of a picture and a name of each of the one or more people (Fig 9, picture, name).

Re claim 7, indicating to the customer by the entertainment machine of the identities of the one or more people having biometric information that most closely matches the biometric information of the customer comprises printing a hardcopy of at least one of a picture and a

name of each of the one or more people (§ 114 output controller, § 115 printer – it is inherent that the printer is used for printing hardcopies).

Re claim 8, A biometric acquisition mechanism to obtain biometric information of a customer; a computer-readable medium having stored thereon a database of biometric information of a plurality of predetermined people with which the customer is likely to be familiar (abstract, database; again it is impossible knowing who the customer is familiar with unless it was determined ahead of time); a comparison mechanism to compare the biometric information of the customer against the database to yield one or more people having biometric information that most closely matches the biometric information of the customer (§ 21); and, an output mechanism to indicate to the customer the one or more people having biometric information that most closely matches the biometric information of the customer (§ 114, output controller).

Re claim 10, the biometric acquisition mechanism comprises one or more of: an image-capturing mechanism to capture at least one of facial images, retinal scans, and eye scans of the customer; a sound-recording mechanism to record voice samples of the customer; and, a touch-sensitive mechanism to obtain at least one of fingerprint scans and handprint scans of the customer (§ 36).

Re claim 11, the database comprises one or more of: a database of biometric information of a plurality of famous individuals; a database of biometric information of a plurality of sports stars; a database of biometric information of a plurality of celebrities; a database of biometric information of a plurality of politicians; a database of biometric information of a plurality of

historical figure; and, a database of biometric information of a plurality of fictitious characters (¶ 148).

Re claim 12, the output mechanism comprises at least one of: a display device, and a printing device (¶ 114 output controller, ¶ 115 printer).

Claims 13 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Family Tree DNA, familytreedna.com.

Re claims 13 and 18, Family Tree DNA teaches a method and system comprising: detecting biometric information of a first customer by an entertainment machine; detecting biometric information of a second customer different than the first customer by the entertainment machine (the first and second customer's DNA is obtained by using a painless cheek scraping); determining how closely the biometric information of the first customer and the biometric information of the second customer match; and, indicating how closely the biometric information of the first customer and the biometric information of the second customer match to the first and the second customers by the entertainment machine (the information is used to determine a relationship with either a 99.9% probability of YES or a 100% certainty that no near term relationships existed. By using the Y-DNA67 test, it can further refine the estimate of how closely related two individuals are, the information is released to both customers of how closely they match each other. Family Tree DNA FAQ, Privacy statements: If a genetic match is found between you and another individual who enters the library at the time in the future, both will be given the information that a potential match is in the database ...)

103(a) rejection:

Claims 9 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Howard (US 2004/0133582 A1) in view of Walker et al (US 6,110,041). The teaching of Howard has been discussed above. However Howard does not teach of a credit-accepting mechanism to accept cash-oriented credit from the customer and in response initiate obtaining the biometric information of the customer, Walker teaches that the machine can accept cash-oriented credit from customers (abstract and fig). Therefore in view of walker, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to use a credit-accepting mechanism to accept cash-oriented credit from the customer for convenience and ease of payment options.

Re claims 13 and 18, Howard teaches of different embodiment of methods of detecting biometric information of a first customer by an entertainment machine; detecting biometric information of a second customer different than the first customer by the entertainment machine (Howard teaches of retrieving biometric information from customers and storing them in a database, using one or more biometric templates associated with an individual to match the individual with others in a facial image database (§ 123-125); determining how closely the biometric information of the first customer and the biometric information of the second customer match (§ 125); Howard further teaches of indicating how closely the biometric information of the first customer and the biometric information of the second customer match, however Howard does not explicitly teach of indicating the information to the first and the second customers by the

entertainment machine. Howard teaches in ¶ 148 that in a computer dating or model/actor search implementation, an individual may be desirous of finding a person in the database who “looks like” their ideal (which ideal may be an image resembling, or example, an ex-girlfriend or boyfriend). It would have been prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to understand that a dating service would inform both of the person of interest if there has been a match found.

Re claim 14, detecting the biometric information comprises acquiring one or more of: facial images; voice samples; fingerprint scans; handprint scans; and, retinal scans (¶ 19 and 26).

Re claim 15, determining how closely the biometric information of the first customer and the biometric information of the second customer match comprises determining a similarity value between the biometric information of the first customer and the biometric information of the second customer (¶ 19 - 26).

Re claim 16, indicating how closely the biometric information of the first customer and the biometric information of the second customer match to the first and the second customers comprises displaying the similarity value (matching score).

Re claim 17, indicating how closely the biometric information of the first customer and the biometric information of the second customer match to the first and the second customers

comprises printing a hardcopy of the similarity value (§ 21, 114 and 115, output controller and printer).

(10) Response to Argument

The argument filed on June 26th 2008 has been considered but is ineffective to overcome the Howard reference. The examiner has further added Family Tree DNA as a new ground of rejection. The applicant's arguments are treated according to the format filed.

Appellant's argument:

The first ground of rejection is whether claim 13 is properly rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by the US patent reference Howard. This ground of rejection is encompassed by the Examiner's rejection of claims 1-8 and 10-18 as being anticipated by Howard. Insofar as claim 13 is patentable over Howard, claims 14-17 which depend from independent claim 13 are patentable as well. Applicant divides out claim 13 as the first ground of rejection because claim 13 is an independent claim, and it is useful to consider the limitations of independent claim 13 alone, apart from any other independent claim.

Thus, claims 13-17 have been rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Howard. Claim 13 is an independent claim, from which claims 14-17 ultimately depend. Applicant submits that claim 13 is not anticipated by Howard, such that claims 14-17 are not anticipated by Howard at least because they depend from an unanticipated base independent claim, claim 13.

Applicant notes that, under 35 USC 102, every limitation of a claim must identically appear in a single prior art reference for it to anticipate the claim. (In re Bond, 15 USPQ2d 1566 (Fed. Cir. 1990)) That is, the standard for anticipation under 35 USC 102 is that "[t]here must be no difference between the claimed invention and the reference disclosure, as viewed by a person of ordinary skill in the field of the invention." (Scripps Clinic & Research Found. v. Genentech, Inc., 18 USPQ2d 1001, 1010 (Fed. Cir. 1991)) While a reference may explicitly or implicitly (i.e., inherently) disclose the claimed invention, it is noted that "[i]nherency... may not be established by probabilities or possibilities. The mere fact that a certain thing may result from a given set of circumstances is not sufficient." (Continental Can Co. USA v. Monsanto Co., 20 USPQ2d 1746, 1749 (Fed. Cir. 1991)) Rather, the

extrinsic evidence "must make clear that the missing descriptive matter is necessarily present in the thing described in the reference." (Id.)

Claim 13 is limited a method that obtains biometric information of two customers - where the second customer is different than the first customer. The method determines how closely they are to one another, and indicates to these customers this measurement of how closely their biometric information is. Thus claim 13 is limited to indicating how closely two customers' biometric information match to these two customers. For example, the value of such a method can be in two people who are dating one another or who are married learning for amusement purposes how closely they look alike, how much they sound alike, and so on.

The most relevant portion of Howard to the embodiments of the claimed invention covered by claim 13 is in paragraph [0022], which reads as follows:

Commercial manufacturers... manufacture biometric recognition systems that can be adapted to be capable of comparing two images. For example, the IDENTIX FACE IT product may be used to compare two facial images to determine whether the two images belong to the same person. Other commercial products are available that can compare two fingerprint images and determine whether the two images belong to the same person.

Howard thus diverges from the claimed invention in at least two significant ways. First, the claimed invention obtains biometric information of a first customer, and then obtains biometric information of a second customer. The second customer is different than the first customer. However, in Howard, you are comparing two images to see if they belong to the same person. As such, it is not inherent in Howard that the first person is different than the second person. In fact, there is at least some likelihood that these two people are the same person; otherwise, there is no point in comparing two images to see if they belong to the same person. Therefore, this aspect of the claimed invention is not anticipated by Howard.

The examiner respectfully disagrees with the appellant's argument and assertion that Howard only teaches of comparing two images of the same person and there is at least some likelihood that these two people are the same person; Howard teaches of different embodiments, one of which teaches that face recognition systems can generate a relatively high percentage of matches in the candidate lists (§ 27). Once the template of the first customer is setup, it searches through the database to generate a list of candidates who has a face score more than a threshold. The person (first customer) may or may not be in the database. Furthermore, Howard teaches of

a different embodiment of computer dating or model/actor search implementation (§ 148).

Howard teaches of "an individual may be desirous of finding a person in the database who "looks like" their ideal (which ideal may be an image resembling, for example, an ex-girlfriend or boyfriend, a celebrity or model..." In this embodiment, Howard is not looking to match the same person, rather looking for a look alike. Therefore the examiner disagrees with the appellant's argument that Howard only teaches of comparing the images of the same person.

Second, Howard does not disclose indicating how closely the biometric information of the first and the second customers match one another to these customers themselves. That is, in the claimed invention, the entertainment machine indicates to the first and the second customers how close their biometric information is. Howard is silent as to this point, and thus cannot explicitly anticipate this aspect of the claimed invention. However, Howard also does not implicitly anticipate this aspect of the claimed invention, either. For example, the usefulness of determining whether two images are of the same person is useful when you are looking at two sets of fingerprints from different crime scenes. In this instance, how closely the two images match is not going to be indicated to the people whose faces or fingerprints are in the images, but rather to a law enforcement or a security user. Therefore, the aspect of the claimed invention in question is not "necessarily present" within Howard, such that the claimed invention is not anticipated by Howard.

The examiner agrees with the appellant's argument that Howard does not explicitly disclose indicating how closely the biometric information of the first and the second customer match one another to these customers themselves. However it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that in a dating service, if a match is found and created, both people would be informed as to the match so they can act upon the information. The examiner also provided Family Tree DNA, which teaches that after the matching information is found, both of the customers would be informed of the result.

In response to Applicant's arguments, the Examiner has grouped claims 13 and 18 together, and stated first that "Applicant's arguments fail to comply with 37 CFR 1.11(b) because they amount to a general allegation that

the claims define a patentable invention without specifically pointing out how the language of the claims patentably distinguishes them from the references." (Final office action, p. 10, para. 6.) Applicant respectfully disagrees. Applicant has explained above how Howard differs from the claimed invention because it does not explicitly or inherently detect biometric information of two different people, as in the claimed invention, and does not explicitly or inherently indicate to these two different people in particular how close their biometric information match. As such, Applicant has specifically pointed out how the language of the claims is distinguished from Howard. Howard does not disclose "detecting biometric information of a second customer different than the first customer," and Howard does not disclose "indicating how closely the biometric information of the first customer and the biometric information of the second customer match to the first and the second customers."

The Examiner has also stated that: It is a mere choice who is informed of [how closely the biometric information match]. It is a mere choice to who is informed of such result, it does not constitute a distinct patentable limitation. Once again, a recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, which it is, then it meets the claim.

(Final office action, p. 10, para. 6.) Applicant respectfully disagrees. First, Applicant notes that claim 13 is limited to a method claim, not an apparatus claim. Indeed, the Examiner has not provided any legal support for his statements that if the structure of the prior art is capable of performing a method, then the structure necessarily anticipates the method, even if the structure is not described as performing the method in the prior art reference in question.

Second, the Examiner says that it is a "mere choice" who is informed of how closely the biometric information of the first customer and the biometric information of the second customer match, such that the last element of claim 13 is not a "distinct patentable limitation," and that this last element of claim 13 is thus an "intended use of the claimed invention." However, the last element of claim 13 is not an intended use of the claimed invention; it is a positive limitation of the method of claim 13, specifically that how closely the biometric information of the first customer and the biometric information of the second customer match is indicated to the first and the second customers. A positive limitation of an action performed by a method cannot be an "intended" use of the method. For instance, claim 13 does not say that how closely the biometric information match is "for indication to the first and the second customers" - that would be an intended use. Rather, claim 13 explicitly recites "indicating how closely the biometric information • . . match to the first and the second customers-" This is a distinct patentable limitation, insofar as Howard does not teach such indication•

It is noted that even if the Board agrees with the Examiner in this respect, Howard still does not anticipate claim 13, because it does not necessarily obtain biometric information of both a first customer and a second customer different than the first customer. The Examiner has not addressed this argument of Applicant other than by saying that it amounts to a general allegation that the claims define a patentable invention without specifically pointing out how the language of the claims patentably distinguishes them from the references. However, as has been discussed above, Applicant has indeed provided a detailed discussion as to how the language of the claims - such as obtaining biometric information of a first customer and a second customer different than the first customer - is not found in Howard. For all of these reasons, Applicant submits that claim 13, and thus claims 14-17 that depend therefrom, are not anticipated by Howard.

Appellant's argument is moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.

Second ground of rejection, as to anticipation of claim 18

Claim has also been rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Howard. Claim 18 is an independent claim, from which claim 19 depends. Applicant submits that claim 18 is not anticipated by Howard, such that claim 19 is not obvious over Howard in view of Walker, as rejected by the Examiner, at least because it depends from an unanticipated base independent claim.

Applicant again notes that, under 35 USC 102, every limitation of a claim must identically appear in a single prior art reference for it to anticipate the claim. (In re Bond, 15 USPQ2d 1566 (Fed. Cir. 1990)) That is, the standard for anticipation under 35 USC 102 is that "[t]here must be no difference between the claimed invention and the reference disclosure, as viewed by a person of ordinary skill in the field of the invention." (Scripps Clinic & Research Found. v. Genentech, Inc., 18 USPQ2d 1001, 1010 (Fed. Cir. 1991)) While a reference may explicitly or implicitly (i.e., inherently) disclose the claimed invention, it is noted that "[i]nherency... may not be established by probabilities or possibilities. The mere fact that a certain thing may result from a given set of circumstances is not sufficient." (Continental Can Co. USA v. Monsanto Co., 20 USPQ2d 1746, 1749 (Fed. Cir. 1991)) Rather, the extrinsic evidence "must make clear that the missing descriptive matter is necessarily present in the thing described in the reference." (Id.)

Claim 18 is the apparatus analog to the method of claim 13. As such, claim 13 is limited an entertainment machine that obtains biometric information of two customers - where the second customer is different than the first customer. The machine determines how closely they are to one another, and indicates to these customers this measurement of how closely their biometric information is. Thus claim 18 is limited to indicating how closely two customers' biometric information match to these two customers. For example, the value of such a machine can be in two people

who are dating one another or who are married learning for amusement purposes how closely they look alike, how much they sound alike, and so on.

As has been discussed in relation to claim 13 above, the most relevant portion of Howard to the embodiments of the claimed invention covered by claim 18 is in paragraph [0022], which reads as follows:

Commercial manufacturers... manufacture biometric recognition systems that can be adapted to be capable of comparing two images. For example, the IDENTIX FACE IT product may be used to compare two facial images to determine whether the two images belong to the same person. Other commercial products are available that can compare two fingerprint images and determine whether the two images belong to the same person.

Howard thus diverges from the claimed invention in at least two significant ways. First, the claimed invention obtains biometric information of a first customer, and then obtains biometric information of a second customer. The second customer is different than the first customer.

However, in Howard, you are comparing two images to see if they belong to the same person. As such, it is not inherent in Howard that the first person is different than the second person. In fact, there is at least some likelihood that these two people are the same person; otherwise, there is no point in comparing two images to see if they belong to the same person. Therefore, this aspect of the claimed invention is not anticipated by Howard.

Second, Howard does not disclose indicating how closely the biometric information of the first and the second customers match one another to these customers themselves. That is, in the claimed invention, the entertainment machine indicates to the first and the second customers how close their biometric information is. Howard is silent as to this point, and thus cannot explicitly anticipate this aspect of the claimed invention. However, Howard also does not implicitly anticipate this aspect of the claimed invention, either. For example, the usefulness of determining whether two images are of the same person is useful when you are looking at two sets of fingerprints from different crime scenes. In this instance, how closely the two images match is not going to be indicated to the people whose faces or fingerprints are in the images, but rather to a law enforcement or a security user. Therefore, the aspect of the claimed invention in question is not "necessarily present" within Howard, such that the claimed invention is not anticipated by Howard.

In response to Applicant's arguments, the Examiner grouped claims 13 and 18 together, and thus stated first, as has been discussed above in relation to claim 13, that "Applicant's arguments fail to comply with 37 CFR 1.11 I(b) because they amount to a general allegation that the claims define a patentable invention without specifically pointing out how the language of the claims patentably distinguishes them from the references." (Final office action, p. 10, para. 6.) Applicant respectfully disagrees. Applicant has explained above how Howard differs from the claimed invention because it does not explicitly or inherently detect biometric information of two different people, as in the claimed invention, and does not explicitly or inherently indicate to these two different people in particular

how close their biometric information match. As such, Applicant has specifically pointed out how the language of the claims is distinguished from Howard. Howard does not disclose "detecting biometric information of a second customer different than the first customer," and Howard does not disclose "indicating how closely the biometric information of the first customer and the biometric information of the second customer match to the first and the second customers."

The Examiner has also stated that: It is a mere choice who is informed of [how closely the biometric information match]. It is a mere choice to who is informed of such result, it does not constitute a distinct patentable limitation. Once again, a recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, which it is, then it meets the claim.

(Final office action, p. 10, para. 6.) Applicant respectfully disagrees. Although the Examiner's arguments here may have more credence in relation to the apparatus of claim 18 as compared to the method of claim 13 - where as has been discussed above, the Examiner's comments are essentially irrelevant to a method claim - they nevertheless do not withstand scrutiny. To say that it is a "mere choice" who is informed of how closely the biometric information of the first customer and the biometric information of the second customer match, such that the last element of claim 18 is not a "distinct patentable limitation," and that this last element of claim 18 thus recites an "intended use of the claimed invention," incorrectly characterizes claim 18.

More specifically, the last element of claim 18 is not an intended use of the claimed invention; it is a positive limitation of the apparatus of claim 18, specifically that the apparatus includes an output mechanism "to indicate to the first customer and the second customer how closely the biometric information of the first customer and the biometric information of the second customer match." A positive limitation of a structural element structurally limits the structural element, and is not an "intended" use of the method. This is a distinct patentable limitation, insofar as Howard does not teach such indication.

It is noted that even if the Board agrees with the Examiner in this respect, Howard still does not anticipate claim 18, because it does not necessarily obtain biometric information of both a first customer and a second customer different than the first customer. The Examiner has not addressed this argument of Applicant other than by saying that it amounts to a general allegation that the claims define a patentable invention without specifically pointing out how the language of the claims patentably distinguishes them from the references. However, as has been discussed above, Applicant has indeed provided a detailed discussion as to how the language of the claims - such as obtaining biometric information of a first customer and a second customer different than the first customer - is not found in Howard. For these reasons, Applicant submits that claim 18, and thus claim 19 that depends therefrom, are not anticipated by Howard.

The argument provided by the appellant toward the second ground of rejection as to anticipation of claim 18 is essentially the same as the arguments toward claim 13 and have been addressed above and will not be repeated herein.

Third ground of rejection, as to anticipation of claim 1

Claims 1-7 have been rejected under 35 USC 102(c) as being anticipated by Howard. Claim 1 is an independent claim, from which claims 2-7 ultimately depend. Applicant submits that claim 1 is not anticipated by Howard, such that claims 2-7 are not anticipated by Howard at least because they depend from an unanticipated base independent claim, claim 1.

Applicant again notes that, under 35 USC 102, every limitation of a claim must identically appear in a single prior art reference for it to anticipate the claim. (In re Bond, 15 USPQ2d 1566 (Fed. Cir. 1990)) That is, the standard for anticipation under 35 USC 102 is that "[i]here must be no difference between the claimed invention and the reference disclosure, as viewed by a person of ordinary skill in the field of the invention." (Scripps Clinic & Research Found. v. Genentech, Inc., 18 USPQ2d 1001, 1010 (Fed. Cir. 1991)) While a reference may explicitly or implicitly (i.e., inherently) disclose the claimed invention, it is noted that "[i]nherency... may not be established by probabilities or possibilities. The mere fact that a certain thing may result from a given set of circumstances is not sufficient." (Continental Can Co. USA v. Monsanto Co., 20 USPQ2d 1746, 1749 (Fed. Cir. 1991)) Rather, the extrinsic evidence "must make clear that the missing descriptive matter is necessarily present in the thing described in the reference." (Id.)

Claim 1 is limited to a method that obtains biometric information of a customer. The method compares this biometric information against a database of biometric information of predetermined people "other than the customer" and "with which the customer is likely to be familiar" to yield people having biometric information that mostly closely matches the biometric information of the customer. The method then indicates these people to the customer. The method is performed "by an entertainment machine."

The most relevant embodiment of Howard to the claimed invention of claim 1 is described in Howard as follows:

We even anticipate that the method of FIG. 6 can be used to implement functionality as disparate as computer dating, searching for models and/or actors, and law enforcement searching. For example, in a computer dating or model/actor search implementation, an individual may be desirous of finding a person in the database who "looks like" their ideal (which ideal may an image resembling, for example, an ex-girlfriend or boyfriend, a celebrity or

model, an idealized image created by the individual, an image that closely resembles the individual himself or herself, etc.)

(Para. [0148]) Let us parse this embodiment of Howard. Claim 1 is limited to detecting biometric information of a customer, determining people with whom the customer is likely to be familiar (and other than the customer him or herself) that have similar biometric information, and then indicating these people to the customer. Thus, finding a model or an actor, or computer dating, as discussed in Howard are most apropos to claim 1. This is because with respect to law enforcement searching, you do not compare the biometric information of someone to the biometric of people other than this person, and then indicate to this person the people who have similar biometric information.

For example, consider a suspect who has left fingerprints on the scene of a crime. A detective may compare those fingerprints to a database of fingerprints of known criminals, in the hope of determining who the suspect is. There is no point in performing this comparison if it is known a priori that the database does not include the fingerprints of the suspect him or herself- and yet this is what the claimed invention is directed to, where you have a database of biometric information of people other than the customer. Furthermore, the database is not likely to be populated with the fingerprints of people with whom the suspect is likely to be familiar. That is not the point of having a fingerprint database. Rather, you want all known criminals and suspect criminals to have their fingerprints in the database, and do not care whether the suspect in question is likely to be familiar with these people (and indeed, want and hope that the suspect is in the database!). Therefore, from the law enforcement perspective, Howard does not anticipate the claimed invention.

As such, what is focused on in more detail is the model/actor finding and computer dating scenarios of Howard. Presumably, in either situation, a user can find a model or an actor that "looks like" himself or herself, or a potential dating partner that "looks like" himself or herself, consistent with the claimed invention. However, the claimed invention is limited to comparing the biometric information of the customer to a database of biometric information of predetermined people "with which the customer is likely to be familiar." It is this limitation that is not explicitly or inherently disclosed in Howard. In first instance, Howard makes no explicit reference to whether the people against which the customer is being compared are people that the customer is familiar with. Explicitly, therefore, Howard does not anticipate this aspect of the claimed invention.

Let us look at implicit or inherent disclosure of this aspect of the claimed invention in Howard, however. First, with respect to computer dating, as can be appreciated by those of ordinary skill within the art and presumably by the Examiner, the idea of computer dating is that you get to learn of potential dating partners that you did not know before. That is, if you knew all the potential dating partners already, then there would be no point to paying for the computer dating service. (For example, consider the online dating service www.match.com, which enables subscribers to "find great dates.") Therefore, it is no inherent that the customer is likely to be familiar with the people against which his or her biometric information is being compared. In fact, the opposite is in greater

likelihood to be true - that the people in the database are people that the customer is not likely to be familiar with, since the customer is paying to find a date with someone, and if the customer already knew all the people in the database, he or she would not have to use the computer dating service. Therefore, this limitation is not "necessarily present" within Howard.

Second with respect to model or actor searching, Howard is silent as to how or why this model or actor searching is to be achieved. There is the scenario envisioned by the claimed invention, in which a user wants to find models or actors that he or she is likely to be familiar with. However, just as likely is another type of model or actor searching. Consider this example: I am a director of a movie, and want a new actor who looks like myself (or who looks like Brad Pitt, Diana Ross, etc.) to play a part in the movie. I do not want to star in the movie myself, and I do not want to pay the high price that Brad Pitt, Diana Ross, or another star with whom I am familiar to star in the movie. Therefore, I use Howard's biometric searching to find someone who I do not know already and who likes like me, Brad Pitt, Diana Ross, or whatever. The idea here, then, is that such a director would be searching among predetermined people with whom he or she is not likely to be familiar - in contradistinction to the claimed invention. Insofar Howard is silent as to how or why model or actor searching is to be performed, this situation is just as likely (if not more so) than the claimed invention, such that the aspect of the claimed invention in question is not "necessarily present" in Howard. As a result, Howard does inherently anticipate this limitation of the claimed invention.

In response to Applicant's arguments, the Examiner has again first stated that a "recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art." (Final office action, p. 9.) However, this statement is uninformative in relation to a method claim, as has been discussed above in relation to claims 13 and 18. Each of the method of claim 1's steps, parts, or acts have to be inherently or explicitly recited in Howard for Howard to anticipate claim 1. Howard does not recite comparing biometric information of a customer against the biometric information of a plurality of predetermined people with which the customer is likely to be familiar, where these predetermined people are other than the customer. This is not an intended use, but an actual positive limitation of claim 1.

Second, the Examiner has stated that the "applicant cannot make arguments to subject matters not claimed," in relation to "a database of biometric information of predetermined people 'with which the customer is likely to be familiar.'" (Final office action, p. 10.) However, claim 1 does indeed explicitly recite the phrase "a database of biometric information of a plurality of predetermined people other than the customer and with which the customer is likely to be familiar." Therefore, Applicant is indeed making arguments to claimed subject matter, in contradistinction to the Examiner's assertion to the contrary. For all of these reasons, therefore, Applicant submits that claim 1 is not anticipated by Howard.

The examiner respectfully disagrees with the argument and analogy provided by the appellant. First the examiner would like to point out there's no support and enablement in the specification for claiming that the customer him/herself would not be in the database and which the customer is likely to be familiar to. Example previously provided by the examiner includes if a celebrity steps up to the machine, the celebrity would most likely find him/herself in the database, in the case of someone who the customer is likely to be familiar to, a tourist coming from other parts of the country may not have the same knowledge as one in the states, therefore they may not know Britney Spears nor Tom Cruise. The appellant provided examples from a law enforcement stand point, where a criminal's profile is being matched in a database by the law enforcement, the criminal's profile is being matched up against all of the criminals in the database as stated by the appellant. However the law enforcement officer does not know whether or not the criminal is in the database, after all there are new criminals emerge everyday in the society and there's no guarantee that the criminal who committed the crime has already been photographed and finger printed. Therefore the limitation comparing the biometric information of the customer against a database of biometric information of plurality of predetermined people other than the customer is met. Howard specifically teaches that the template are created in many different ways (Mug shots, finger print exemplars, photographs, video stills, digitized or scanned images, image captured at a capture station, information provided by other databases, and /or sketches. When the criminal is apprehended, his or her biometrics is being compared not only to the existing criminal database who has been identified, but also to the database of criminals who has yet to be caught. Therefore this is another example of how the law

enforcement uses the "customer's" biometric information against a plurality of predetermined people other than the customer. The appellant further argues that the limitation states that the database has to be full of people that the customer is likely to be familiar to, one would argue that in the criminal society, the customer would be familiar with the other criminals in the database. Therefore the examiner asserts that Howard anticipates the claimed invention.

The appellant further argues that there's no explicit teaching in Howard searching for a model/actor. The examiner respectfully disagrees with the example provided by the appellant and points to ¶ 148, the stated intended purpose is to "the method can be used to implement functionality as disparate as computer dating, searching for models and / or actors..." The examiner assumes that the models and actors are currently models and actors who the customer is likely to be familiar with. Howard further teaches that the template being searched could be "an image that closely resembles the individual himself or herself". Therefore the examiner asserts that the disclosure provided by Howard is exactly the same as the claimed invention, finding a look alike of the customer among a celebrity database. Therefore in this aspect, the examiner asserts that Howard anticipates the claimed invention as well.

Fourth ground of rejection, as to anticipation of claim 8

Claims 8-12 have been rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Howard. Claim 8 is an independent claim, from which claims 9-12 ultimately depend. Applicant submits that claim 8 is not anticipated by Howard, such that claim 9 is not obvious over Howard in view of Walker, as rejected by the Examiner, and such that claims 10-12 are not anticipated by Howard, at least because they depend from an unanticipated base independent claim, claim 8.

Applicant again notes that, under 35 USC 102, every limitation of a claim must identically appear in a single prior art reference for it to anticipate the claim. (In re Bond, 15 USPQ2d 1566 (Fed. Cir. 1990)) That is, the standard for anticipation under 35 USC 102 is that "[t]here must be no difference between the claimed invention and the reference disclosure, as viewed by a person of ordinary skill in the field of the invention." (Scripps Clinic & Research Found. v. Genentech, Inc., 18 USPQ2d 1001, 1010 (Fed. Cir. 1991)) While a reference may explicitly or implicitly (i.e., inherently) disclose the claimed invention, it is noted that "[i]nherency... may not be established by probabilities or possibilities. The mere fact that a certain thing may result from a given set of circumstances is not sufficient." (Continental Can Co. USA v. Monsanto Co., 20 USPQ2d 1746, 1749 (Fed. Cir. 1991)) Rather, the extrinsic evidence "must make clear that the missing descriptive matter is necessarily present in the thing described in the reference." (Id.)

Claim 8 is to at least some extent the apparatus analog to the method of claim 1. As such, claim 8 is limited to an entertainment machine that obtains biometric information of a customer. The machine compares this biometric information against a database of biometric information of predetermined people "other than the customer" and "with which the customer is likely to be familiar" to yield people having biometric information that mostly closely matches the biometric information of the customer. The machine then indicates these people to the customer. The method is performed "by an entertainment machine."

As has been discussed in relation to claim 1 above, the most relevant embodiment of Howard to the claimed invention of claim 8 is described in Howard as follows:

We even anticipate that the method of FIG. 6 can be used to implement functionality as disparate as computer dating, searching for models and/or actors, and law enforcement searching. For example, in a computer dating or model/actor search implementation, an individual may be desirous of finding a person in the database who "looks like" their ideal (which ideal may an image resembling, for example, an ex-girlfriend or boyfriend, a celebrity or model, an idealized image created by the individual, an image that closely resembles the individual himself or herself, etc.)

(Para. [0148]) Let us again parse this embodiment of Howard. Claim 8 is limited to detecting biometric information of a customer, determining people with whom the customer is likely to be familiar that have similar biometric information, and then indicating these people to the customer. Thus, finding a model or an actor, or computer dating, as discussed in Howard are most apropos to claim 8. This is because with respect to law enforcement searching, you do not compare the biometric information of someone to the biometric of people other than this person, and then indicate to this person the people who have similar biometric information.

For example, consider a suspect who has left fingerprints on the scene of a crime. A detective may compare those fingerprints to a database of fingerprints of known criminals, in the hope of determining who the suspect is. The database is not likely to be populated with the fingerprints of people with whom the suspect is likely to be familiar.

That is not the point of having a fingerprint database. Rather, you want all known criminals and suspect criminals to have their fingerprints in the database, and do not care whether the suspect in question is likely to be familiar with these people. Therefore, from the law enforcement perspective, Howard does not anticipate the claimed invention.

As such, what is focused on in more detail is again the model/actor finding and computer dating scenarios of Howard. Presumably, in either situation, a user can find a model or an actor that "looks like" himself or herself, or a potential dating partner that "looks like" himself or herself, consistent with the claimed invention. However, the claimed invention is limited to comparing the biometric information of the customer to a database of biometric information of predetermined people "with which the customer is likely to be familiar." It is this limitation that is not explicitly or inherently disclosed in Howard. In first instance, Howard makes no explicit reference to whether the people against which the customer is being compared are people that the customer is familiar with. Explicitly, therefore, Howard does not anticipate this aspect of the claimed invention.

Let us look at implicit or inherent disclosure of this aspect of the claimed invention in Howard, however. First, with respect to computer dating, as can be appreciated by those of ordinary skill within the art and presumably by the Examiner, the idea of computer dating is that you get to learn of potential dating partners that you did not know before. That is, if you knew all the potential dating partners already, then there would be no point to paying for the computer dating service. (For example, consider the online dating service www.match.com, which enables subscribers to "find great dates.") Therefore, it is no inherent that the customer is likely to be familiar with the people against which his or her biometric information is being compared. In fact, the opposite is in greater likelihood to be true - that the people in the database are people that the customer is not likely to be familiar with, since the customer is paying to find a date with someone, and if the customer already knew all the people in the database, he or she would not have to use the computer dating service. Therefore, this limitation is not "necessarily present" within Howard.

Second with respect to model or actor searching, Howard is silent as to how or why this model or actor searching is to be achieved. There is the scenario envisioned by the claimed invention, in which a user wants to find models or actors that he or she is likely to be familiar with. However, just as likely is another type of model or actor searching. Consider this example: I am a director of a movie, and want a new actor who looks like myself (or who looks like Brad Pitt, Diana Ross, etc.) to play a part in the movie. I do not want to star in the movie myself, and I do not want to pay the high price that Brad Pitt, Diana Ross, or another star with whom I am familiar to star in the movie. Therefore, I use Howard's biometric searching to find someone who I do not know already and who looks like me, Brad Pitt, Diana Ross, or whatever. The idea here, then, is that such a director would be searching among predetermined people with whom he or she is not likely to be familiar - in contradistinction to the claimed invention. Insofar Howard is silent as to how or why model or actor searching is to be performed, this situation is just as likely (if not more so) than the claimed invention, such that the aspect of the claimed invention in question is

not "necessarily present" in Howard. As a result, Howard does inherently anticipate this limitation of the claimed invention.

In response to Applicant's arguments, the Examiner has again first stated that a "recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art." (Final office action, p. 9.) Although this statement may have more credence in relation to the apparatus of claim 8 as compared to the method of claim 1, it nevertheless does not withstand scrutiny. Claim 8's limitations have to be inherently or explicitly recited in Howard for Howard to anticipate claim 1. Howard does not recite comparing biometric information of a customer against the biometric information of a plurality of predetermined people with which the customer is likely to be familiar. This is not an intended use, but an actual positive limitation of claim 8. Second, the Examiner has stated that the "applicant cannot make arguments to subject matters not claimed," in relation to "a database of biometric information of predetermined people 'with which the customer is likely to be familiar.'" (Final office action, p. 10.) Again, however, claim 8 does indeed explicitly recite the phrase "a database of biometric information of a plurality of predetermined people other than the customer and with which the customer is likely to be familiar." Therefore, Applicant is indeed making arguments to claimed subject matter, in contradistinction to the Examiner's assertion to the contrary. For all of these reasons, therefore, Applicant submits that claim 8 is not anticipated by Howard.

The arguments provided in the fourth ground of rejection as to the anticipation of claim 8 is essentially the same as the third ground of rejection to the anticipation of claim 1 as discussed above and not repeated herein.

Fifth ground of rejection, as to enablement of claims 1-7

Claims 1-7 have been rejected under 35 USC 112, first paragraph, as not being enabled. In particular, the Examiner has stated that, as to the limitation of claim 1 regarding "a plurality of predetermined people other than the customer," it is unclear how the customer can be excluded from the predetermined people in the database in view of the specification. Applicant respectfully disagrees, and very respectfully submits that it is crucial to understand this limitation vis-a-vis the specification to understand the scope of this embodiment of the invention.

The standard governing enablement under 35 USC 112, first paragraph, is "whether one reasonably skilled in the art could make or use the invention from the disclosures in the patent [application] coupled with information known in the art without undue experimentation." (United States v. Telectronics, Inc., 857 F.2d 778, 785, 8 USPQ2d 1217,

Art Unit: 3714

1223 (Fed. Cir. 1988)) As to how to "make" the invention, as long as the specification discloses at least one method for making the claimed invention that bears a reasonable correlation to the entire scope of the claim, then the enablement requirement of 35 USC 112 is satisfied. (In re Fisher, 427 F.2d 833, 839, 166 USPQ 18, 24 (CCPA 1970)) As to how to "use" the invention, if a statement of utility in the specification contains within it a connotation of how to use, and/or the art recognizes that standard modes of administration are known and contemplated, 35 USC 112 is satisfied. (In re Johnson, 282 F.2d 370, 373, 127 USPQ 216, 219 (CCPA 1960)).

In light of this discussion, Applicant notes that as to the embodiment of the invention covered by claim 1, the idea is that the "biometric information of the customer is compared against a database of biometric information of people other than the customer, to yield one or more people having biometric information that most closely matches biometric information of the customer." (Specification, p. 4, 11. 14-17) "Importantly, the database preferably does not include biometric information of the customer him or herself." (Id., p. 4, 11. 19-22) "This is because the goal is not identification of the customer - i.e., determining the customer's identity - but rather for amusement and entertainment to indicate to the customer other people that have similar biometric information as that of the customer." (Id., p. 4, 1.22, through p. 5, 1.2)

Thus, as is clear from the patent application as filed, the idea in claim 1 is that you can get your biometric information scanned - e.g., such as your face (Specification, p. 4, 11. 19-21) - and then see what other people are similar to you biometrically, such as other people that look like you, for amusement purposes. "People may be interested to learn, for example, what sports stars their faces most closely resemble, or the movie stars who have hand geometries most similar to them." (Id., p. 2, 11. 6-8) "The people in the database "are preferably famous individuals, such as sports stars, celebrities, politicians, and historical figures." (Id., p. 5, 11. 3-4) "Furthermore, the people may be fictitious persons or characters, such as popular cartoon characters." (Id., p. 5, 11.4-5) "The intention in one embodiment of the invention is to have biometric of people with which typical customers are likely to be familiar." (Id., p. 5, 11. 5-7) As such, "the customer can learn whom he or she 'looks like' or 'sounds like,' as determined biometrically." (Id., p. 5, 11. 9-10)

Therefore, the exclusion of the customer from the plurality of predetermined people gets to the heart of this embodiment of the invention. For amusement and entertainment, a customer learns who he or she resembles from this plurality of predetermined people. Obviously, the customer most resembles him or herself- and this is one reason why he or she is not included in the plurality of predetermined people. The point is that these are predetermined people who the customer is likely to be familiar with. A customer can find out, for instance, that he looks like Brad Pitt, or that she sounds like Diana Ross. The patent application as filed most definitively enables the predetermined people not including the customer him or herself, since this is the whole point of this embodiment of the invention.

Therefore, Applicant submits that claim 1, and claims 2-7 that depend therefrom, are enabled by the specification as filed. As to "making" the invention, the specification discloses a method that bears more than "a reasonable correlation" to the entire scope of claim 1, such that the enablement requirement specified by *In re Fisher* above is satisfied. As to "using" the invention, there is more than a "connotation" of how to use the invention of claim 1, such that the enablement requirement specified by *In re Johnson* above is also satisfied.

In response, the Examiner has stated first that the specification on page 4, lines 15-17 states that the database preferably does not include biometric information of the customer him or herself, but that such claim limitations are not recited in claim 1. (See final office action, p. 9.) However, the phrases "a plurality of people other than the customer" and "a plurality of people not including the customer" are linguistically equivalent. Applicant chose to use the former phrase in claim 1 instead of the latter phrase because the former phrase does not include the word "not," which is a negative limitation that is preferred to not be included in claim language. Thus, the claim limitation of page 4, lines 15-17 is indeed recited in claim 1, and in any case, the standard governing enablement is satisfied. That is, the phrase "a plurality of people other than the customer" bears a reasonable correlation to the phrase "a plurality of people not including the customer," such that the former phrase in claim 1 is enabled by the latter phrase in the specification of the patent application as filed.

The Examiner has also stated that "how would the computer distinguish between a celebrity who is also a customer/player of such invention, if Brad Pitt or Jennifer Aniston wants to play the entertainment machine, how would the machine eliminate Brad Pitt or Jennifer Aniston from the searchable database." (Final office action, p. 9.) Applicant notes that claim 1 is directed to a method that recites usage of an entertainment machine, and in at least this respect, Applicant's reply to the Examiner's question is that claim 1 would simply not be infringed in such a situation - that is, the issue here is one of infringement, not enablement. Claim 1 is directed to detecting biometric information of a customer and comparing this biometric information against the biometric information of a number of people other than the customer. Insofar as the customer is one of these people, then claim 1 is just not infringed in this case. Enablement has nothing to do with this situation.

The Examiner's concern that the biometric information of a customer may be in the database of biometric information is, in other words, a red herring that does not speak to enablement, but rather to infringement. Claim 1 is directed to a method that compares biometric information of a customer against biometric information of people other than the customer. If the customer in question is one of these people, then quite simply this situation is not covered by the method of claim 1. The legal standard of enablement does not require disclosure in the instant specification of a "computer" distinguishing between a celebrity who is also a customer/player and/or the "machine" eliminating Brad Pitt or Jennifer Aniston from the searchable database, as the Examiner would like. The method of claim 1, that is, does not have to distinguish between a celebrity who is also a customer/player, and does not have to eliminate such celebrities from the searchable database when the play. Rather, if a customer attempts to play in accordance with the method of claim 1 and his or her biometric information is in the database, then claim 1 is

simply not infringed. There is no enablement issue here; Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner is confusing infringement with enablement.

For these reasons, therefore, Applicant submits that claims 1-7 are enabled by the specification to the satisfaction of 35 USC 112, first paragraph.

The examiner respectfully disagrees with the appellant's argument. The examiner asserts that the specification fails to disclose how one would make such a machine or database that would exclude the current customer from the database. Nor does the specification provide a method of having a database full of people that the customer is likely to be familiar with. The appellant points out the specific sections of the specification to where the appellant believes the claims are supported such as pages 4 and 5, the examiner fails to find any disclosure of the enablement of excluding the current customer from the database and having the database full of people that the customer is familiar with. The appellant's specification simply points out that the intended purpose of this entertainment machine is to find people that the customer would know, "Brad Pitt and or Diana Ross" and assuming that the customer themselves are not Brad Pitt and Diana Ross. The examiner previously provided counter-examples of people in remote locales might not know who Brad Pitt or Diana Ross is, one of ordinary skill in the art would not be able to make of such database that are populated by people that the customer would know based on the specification provided by the appellant. Furthermore the appellant's specification does not provide a method of preventing the current customer to be in the database themselves, assuming Brad Pitt decides to step up to the machine, one of ordinary skill in the art would not be able to make a machine or database that would exclude Brad Pitt from the database in view of appellant's specification. The appellant's whole argument relies on the assumption that everyone

in the world would know Brad Pitt and Diana Ross and that Brad Pitt and Diana Ross would never use the entertainment machines themselves ever, these assumptions are fundamentally flawed. Therefore the examiner asserts that the appellant's specification does not meet the enablement requirement set forth in 35 USC 112, first paragraph.

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

This examiner's answer contains a new ground of rejection set forth in section (9) above. Accordingly, appellant must within **TWO MONTHS** from the date of this answer exercise one of the following two options to avoid *sua sponte* **dismissal of the appeal** as to the claims subject to the new ground of rejection:

(1) **Reopen prosecution.** Request that prosecution be reopened before the primary examiner by filing a reply under 37 CFR 1.111 with or without amendment, affidavit or other evidence. Any amendment, affidavit or other evidence must be relevant to the new grounds of rejection. A request that complies with 37 CFR 41.39(b)(1) will be entered and considered. Any request that prosecution be reopened will be treated as a request to withdraw the appeal.

(2) **Maintain appeal.** Request that the appeal be maintained by filing a reply brief as set forth in 37 CFR 41.41. Such a reply brief must address each new ground of rejection as set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(c)(1)(vii) and should be in compliance with the other requirements of 37 CFR 41.37(c). If a reply brief filed pursuant to 37 CFR 41.39(b)(2) is accompanied by any amendment, affidavit or other evidence, it shall be treated as a request that prosecution be reopened before the primary examiner under 37 CFR 41.39(b)(1).

Extensions of time under 37 CFR 1.136(a) are not applicable to the TWO MONTH time period set forth above. See 37 CFR 1.136(b) for extensions of time to reply for patent applications and 37 CFR 1.550(c) for extensions of time to reply for ex parte reexamination proceedings.

Respectfully submitted,

/Kang Hu/

Examiner, Art Unit 3714

A Technology Center Director or designee must personally approve the new ground(s) of rejection set forth in section (9) above by signing below:

/Robert P Olszewski/

Director, Technology Center 3714

Conferees:

/XUAN M. THAI/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3714

/Gene Kim/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3711

